



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The general rule has been subjected to much adverse criticism. 4 WIGMORE EV. 3037 *et seq.* The motive actuating the courts in making such liberal constructions of these statutes has been the amelioration of this general rule. But it is suggested that this is a matter for legislative remedy, not of judicial intermeddling involving violations of accepted legal principles of statutory construction.

WITNESSES — EFFECT OF FALSE TESTIMONY — PRESUMPTIONS. — Defendant had dynamite caps in his possession upon his farm. He sold farm to plaintiff. Later plaintiff's minor son was injured by the explosion of a dynamite cap, which, it is claimed, was picked up by a child in the barnyard. While defendant testified that he had disposed of the caps before the occurrence of the injury, witnesses testified that he had previously denied ever having had any caps on the premises. *Held*, it is a question for the jury, and if they believe the defendant gave a false account of the disposition of the caps, they are at liberty to infer that the truth would be unfavorable to him. *Eckart v. Kiel* (Minn.), 143 N. W. 122.

Statutes allowing parties to a civil suit to testify place such persons on the same ground as to competency as other witnesses, their interest affecting their credibility only. *Cowles v. Bacon*, 21 Conn. 451, 56 Am. Dec. 371; *Cutler v. Succession of Collins*, 37 La. Ann. 95.

The mere fact that a party to a suit does not offer himself as a witness is not ground for an inference that his testimony would be unfavorable to his side of the controversy. *City of New Orleans v. Gaunthreaux* 32 La. Ann. 1126. But the non-appearance of a party litigant, or his failure to testify as to facts material to his case and peculiarly within his own knowledge, or his refusal to produce evidence in his possession, creates a presumption that the truth if made to appear would be unfavorable to his contention. *Cole v. Lake Shore, etc., R. Co.*, 95 Mich. 77. 54 N. W. 638; *Central Stock, etc., Exch. v. Chicago Bd. of Trade*, 196 Ill. 396, 63 N. E. 740; *Bastrop State Bank v. Levy*, 106 La. 586, 31 So. 740; *Heath v. Waters*, 40 Mich. 457; *Kirby v. Tallmadge*, 160 U. S. 379. Under the doctrine, *falsus in uno falsus in omnibus*, the jury may reject the entire testimony of a witness when he willfully testifies falsely to a material fact, though it is not obliged to do so. *Mann v. Arkansas, etc., Co.*, 24 Fed. 261; *Rider v. People*, 110 Ill. 11; *Reynolds v. Greenbaum*, 80 Ill. 416. And attempts to bribe or intimidate a witness, or to conceal evidence, or intentional failure to produce the witness who was in the best position to relate the true circumstances of the case, or intentional falsehoods as to a material fact by the defendant, are facts from which the jury are at liberty to presume that the truth, if revealed, would be unfavorable to the cause of the defendant. *Chicago City R. Co. v. McMahon*, 103 Ill. 485; *Keeiser v. State*, 154 Ind. 242. 56 N. E. 232; *Commonwealth v. Wallace*, 203 Ill. 306, 67 N. E. 799; *State v. Hogan*, 67 Conn. 581. 35 Atl. 508; *Commonwealth v. Devancy*, 182 Mass. 33, 64 N. E. 402; *State v. Benner*, 16 Me. 267.